

1 Jeffrey R. Hall (9572)  
 2 HUTCHISON & STEFFEN, PLLC  
 3 Peccole Professional Park  
 4 10080 West Alta Drive, Suite 200  
 5 Las Vegas, NV 89145  
 Tel: (702) 385-2500  
 Fax: (702) 385-2086  
 jhall@hutchlegal.com

6 My Chi To  
 7 Erica S. Weisgerber  
 Danielle Thorne  
 DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP  
 8 919 Third Avenue  
 New York, NY 10022  
 Telephone: (212) 909-6000  
 9 Fax: (212) 909-6836  
 mcto@debevoise.com  
 eweisgerber@debevoise.com  
 dethorne@debevoise.com

12 *Attorneys for chargeIT Mobility GmbH, Germany*

13 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**

14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 In re  
 16 DOUBLE JUMP, INC.

17 Debtor.

- 19      Affects ALL Debtors
- 20      Affects Double Jump, Inc.
- 21      Affects Dora Dog Properties, LLC
- 22      Affects Dog Blue Properties, LLC
- 23      Affects Brandy Boy Properties, LLC
- 24      Affects 475 Channel Road, LLC
- 25      Affects Park Road, LLC
- 26      Affects 140 Mason Circle, LLC
- 27      X Affects DC Solar Solutions, Inc.
- 28      Affects DC Solar Distribution, Inc.
- 29      Affects DC Solar Freedom, Inc.

Lead Case No.: BK-19-50102-btb  
 Chapter 7

In Joint Administration with:

19-50103-btb	Dora Dog Properties, LLC
19-50104-btb	Dog Blue Properties, LLC
19-50105-btb	Brandy Boy Properties, LLC
19-50106-btb	475 Channel Road, LLC
19-50108-btb	Park Road, LLC
19-50109-btb	140 Mason Circle, LLC
19-50130-btb	DC Solar Solutions, Inc.
19-50131-btb	DC Solar Distribution, Inc.
19-50135-btb	DC Solar Freedom, Inc.

**JOINT MOTION TO APPROVE  
 SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT PURSUANT  
 TO FRBP 9019**

25 **Hearing Date: December 9, 2019**

26  
 27 **Hearing Time: 9:30 a.m.**

1 Christina W. Lovato, in her capacity as Chapter 7 Trustee in the above-captioned cases, on  
 2 behalf of DC Solar Solutions, Inc. and its affiliated entities (the “Trustee”), and chargeIT Mobility,  
 3 Gmbh (“chargeIT”), by and through their respective undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully submit  
 4 this motion (the “Motion”) requesting entry of an order in the form attached hereto as **Exhibit “1”**  
 5 approving that certain Settlement Agreement (the “Settlement Agreement”) attached hereto as **Exhibit**  
 6 **“2,”**<sup>1</sup> entered into by and among the Trustee, the Debtors, and chargeIT (collectively, the “Parties”)  
 7 pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019<sup>2</sup> and authorizing the Parties to take any and all actions necessary  
 8 to effectuate the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

9 The Motion is made and based on the memorandum of points and authorities provided herein,  
 10 the pleadings, papers, and other records on file with the clerk of the Court, judicial notice of which is  
 11 hereby requested, and the argument of counsel entertained by the Court at the time of the hearing of  
 12 the Motion.

13 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

14 **I. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND BASIS FOR RELIEF**

15 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334.  
 16 Consideration of the Motion is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(A) and (B). Venue  
 17 in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

18 2. The basis for the relief sought herein arises from Bankruptcy Rules 1017 and 9019 and  
 19 11 U.S.C. § 1112.

20 3. Pursuant to Local Rule 9014.2, the Parties consent to entry of final order(s) or  
 21 judgment(s) by the bankruptcy judge if it is determined that the bankruptcy judge, absent consent of  
 22 the parties, cannot enter final orders for judgment consistent with Article III of the United States  
 23 Constitution.

---

24  
 25 <sup>1</sup> Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have those meanings ascribed to them in the  
 Settlement Agreement.

26 <sup>2</sup> All references to “Chapter” and “Section” hereinafter are to title 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532 (the  
 27 “Bankruptcy Code”); all references to a “Bankruptcy Rule” are to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy  
 Procedure; and all references to a “Local Rule” are to the Local Rules of Bankruptcy Practice for the  
 28 U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

1       **II. FACTS**

2       1. In 2017, Solutions and chargeIT, a company incorporated in Germany, entered into an  
 3 agreement for Solutions to purchase certain technology hardware relating to a Supervisory Control  
 4 Access Data Analysis (“SCADA”) system (such hardware, collectively, the “SCADA Units”) from  
 5 chargeIT. Purchase orders (the “Purchase Orders”) and invoices (the “Invoices”) were prepared  
 6 detailing the items, quantity, rate and amount charged in connection with the purchase. *See Exhibit*  
 7 **3**, June 26, 2017 Purchase Order; **Exhibit 4**, August 31, 2017 Purchase Order; Exhibit 1, Settlement  
 8 Agreement at Exhibit A, Invoices.

9       2. The Invoices indicate that chargeIT’s general terms and conditions of business (the  
 10 “General Terms & Conditions”) applied to and governed the sale. A copy of the General Terms &  
 11 Conditions is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.<sup>3</sup> The Invoices further indicate that the place of fulfillment  
 12 of deliveries and payments is Kitzingen, Germany. *See Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, at Exhibit*  
 13 **A, Invoices**. The General Terms & Conditions provide for jurisdiction over disputes in Kitzingen,  
 14 Germany and further provide that German law governs the relationship between chargeIT and its  
 15 customer. *See Exhibit 5 at 11.*

16       3. Consistent with the provisions of the General Terms & Conditions and the Invoices,  
 17 Solutions made a 50% down payment at the time of order, to confirm its purchases. *See Exhibit 1,*  
 18 *Settlement Agreement, at Exhibit A, Invoices*. The balance was due upon delivery. The Invoices  
 19 indicate that the delivery dates for the SCADA Units ranged from October 2017 through December  
 20 2018. *See id.* Solutions did not pay the balance due under the Invoices upon delivery of the SCADA  
 21 Units.

22       4. After the SCADA Units were delivered, chargeIT requested payment from Solutions  
 23 but did not receive such payment.

24       5. On January 30, 2019 (the “Petition Date”), Double Jump, Inc. filed a Chapter 11  
 25 petition and on February 3, 4 and 5, 2019, respectively, DC Solar Solutions, Inc., DC Solar  
 26 Distributions, Inc. and DC Solar Freedom, Inc., each filed Chapter 11 petitions. On January 30, 2019,

---

27       <sup>3</sup> Although the General Terms & Conditions are in German, a certified translation of the General  
 28 Terms & Conditions are attached for reference. *See Exhibit 5.*

1 six related entities also filed Chapter 11 petitions: Dora Dog Properties, LLC, Dog Blue Properties,  
 2 LLC, Brandy Boy Properties, LLC, 475 Channel Road LLC, Park Road, LLC and Mason Circle LLC.  
 3 The ten chapter 11 cases are being jointly administered by Order entered February 12, 2019. *See ECF*  
 4 No. 97.

5       6. On March 22, 2019, the Chapter 11 cases of all debtors were converted to cases under  
 6 Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. *See ECF No. 438.* Christina W. Lovato was appointed as the  
 7 Trustee. *See ECF Nos. 439, 440.*

8       7. On May 2, 2019, the Trustee filed a *Motion for (1) Order Authorizing Employment of*  
 9 *CA Global Partners, Inc. as Consultant for the Purpose of Conducting an Auction of Personal*  
 10 *Property Inventory; and (2) Order Authorizing Sale Free and Clear of Liens and Encumbrances by*  
 11 *Auction* (the “Sale Motion”). The Sale Motion sought court permission to auction certain  
 12 “unencumbered personal property owned by the chapter 7 estates of Solutions, Distribution and  
 13 Freedom” and an order authorizing the sale “by auction, free and clear of liens and encumbrances of  
 14 personal property inventory owned by Solutions, Distribution and Freedom located at a variety of  
 15 locations at which those entities conducted business activities.” *See ECF No. 666, at 2.* The Sale  
 16 Motion further acknowledged that Schedules of Assets and Liabilities and Statements of Financial  
 17 Affairs for Solutions, Distributions and Freedom were not yet filed, but sought to conduct an auction  
 18 in short term to “gain maximum market exposure.” *Id.* The Trustee simultaneously filed an *Ex Parte*  
 19 *Motion for Order Shortening Time for Hearing on the Sale Motion.* *See ECF No. 672.*

20       8. On May 17, 2019, the Court entered the requested auction order. *See ECF No. 773.*

21       9. Thereafter, chargeIT learned that the SCADA Units were being sold at the auction,  
 22 through an online auction site. *See* [\*https://www.industrialbid.com/auctions/3648-huge-2-day-\*](https://www.industrialbid.com/auctions/3648-huge-2-day-auction-new-mobile-solar-generator-parts-inventory-over-50-million-cost-day-2-auction/)  
 23 [\*auction-new-mobile-solar-generator-parts-inventory-over-50-million-cost-day-2-auction/.\*](https://www.industrialbid.com/auctions/3648-huge-2-day-auction-new-mobile-solar-generator-parts-inventory-over-50-million-cost-day-2-auction/) Upon  
 24 learning of the sale, chargeIT contacted U.S. counsel, who liaised with Trustee’s counsel. The Parties  
 25 disputed the ownership of title to the property and were unable to reach a resolution regarding the  
 26 disputed property.

27       10. On June 10, 2019, counsel for the Trustee informed chargeIT’s counsel that because  
 28 chargeIT had not “perfected” its lien, he had authorized the auction of the SCADA Units to proceed.

1 On June 12, 2019, chargeIT filed the *Emergency Motion to Exclude Certain Property from Auction*  
 2 (ECF No. 845) to request that the Court order that the SCADA Units be segregated from the auction.

3       11. That day, the Court granted chargeIT's emergency motion and entered an *Order on*  
 4 *Emergency Motion to Exclude Certain Property from Auction* (the "Exclusion Order") (ECF No. 847)  
 5 to exclude the SCADA Units from the auction. Following entry of the Exclusion Order, the Trustee  
 6 pulled the SCADA Units from the auction, but several units had already been sold.

7       12. A status hearing was held on June 17, 2019 before the Court. The Parties indicated  
 8 that they would engage in further discussions and, if unsuccessful, would set a briefing schedule for  
 9 the dispute.

10       13. Following arms' length negotiations, and in order to avoid the protracted litigation that  
 11 would likely ensue as a result of the Parties' dispute, the Parties have agreed to a settlement, as  
 12 memorialized in the Settlement Agreement.

13       14. Upon review of the Settlement Agreement, the Trustee believes that the settlement is  
 14 in the best interests of the creditors and respectfully requests that this Motion be granted.

### 15       **III. TERMS OF SETTLEMENT**

16       1. The Trustee, on behalf of Solutions, and chargeIT have entered into a settlement under  
 17 which chargeIT can retake possession of the 1719 SCADA Units remaining in Solutions' possession  
 18 (the "Reclaimed SCADA Units") and the attendant cable harnesses and Power Converters (48V-24V)  
 19 remaining in Solutions' possession (the "Reclaimed Power Converters"), to the extent available at  
 20 4901 Park Road, Benicia, California 94510, the location of the SCADA Units. chargeIT has agreed  
 21 to prepare an inventory specifying the number of Reclaimed Power Converters (the "Inventory") that  
 22 it recovers, and provide such Inventory to the Trustee.

23       2. chargeIT will also be permitted to assert an allowed, unsecured claim for 50% of the  
 24 total value of the 281 SCADA Units that it delivered to Solutions that are not among the Reclaimed  
 25 SCADA Units in the amount of \$195,716.50 (such SCADA Units, the "Remaining SCADA Units,"  
 26 and such claim, "Allowed Claim 1"). chargeIT also will be permitted to assert an allowed, unsecured  
 27 claim for 50% of the total value of any Power Converters that it delivered to Solutions that are not  
 28 Reclaimed Power Converters (such Power Converters, the "Remaining Power Converters," and such

1 claim, “Allowed Claim 2,” and together with Allowed Claim 1, the “Allowed Claims.”). chargeIT  
 2 has informed the Trustee that it has recovered 1719 Power Converters, and thus maintains a claim for  
 3 281 Remaining Power Converters totaling \$7,587.00. If any of the Remaining SCADA Units or  
 4 Remaining Power Converters are returned to chargeIT following their later identification by Solutions,  
 5 chargeIT will not be permitted to assert a claim for those items. chargeIT also shall not need to file a  
 6 new proof of claim with respect to the Allowed Claims.

7       3. chargeIT will withdraw the proof of claim it executed and submitted in these cases on  
 8 February 28, 2019. The Settlement Agreement further contains standard mutual releases. Except for  
 9 the Allowed Claims, chargeIT will not be allowed to assert any other claims against Solutions,  
 10 including claims for costs and expenses, lost profits, or other damages resulting from Solutions’  
 11 bankruptcy or the instant dispute.

12 **IV.     LEGAL ARGUMENT**

13 **A.     The Settlement Agreement Should Be Approved Pursuant to Fed. R. Bank. P. 9019.**

14       1. Compromise and settlement agreements have long been an inherent component of the  
 15 bankruptcy process. *See Protective Comm. for Index Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry v. Anderson*,  
 16 390 U.S. 414, 424 (1958) (citing *Case v. Los Angeles Lumber Prods. Co.*, 308 U.S. 106, 130 (1939)).  
 17 The approval of compromises or settlements in bankruptcy proceedings is generally governed by  
 18 Bankruptcy Rule 9019(a), which provides:

19       On motion by the trustee and after notice and a hearing, the court may approve a  
 20 compromise or settlement. Notice shall be given to creditors, the United States  
 21 trustee, the debtor, and indenture trustees as provided in Rule 2002 and to any other  
 22 entity as the court may direct.

23 Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9019(a).

24       2. Compromises are favored in bankruptcy; thus, the decision of the bankruptcy judge to  
 25 approve or disapprove the compromise of the parties rests in his or her sound discretion. *See In re*  
 26 *Stein*, 236 B.R. 34, 37 (Bankr. D. Or. 1999). The law prefers compromise “as long as the bankruptcy  
 27 court amply considered the various factors that determined the reasonableness of the compromise.”  
*Martin v. Kane (In re A & C Properties)*, 784 F.2d 1377, 1381 (9th Cir. 1986). Public policy supports  
 28 pretrial compromises because litigation “can occupy a court’s docket for years on end, depleting

1 resources of the parties and the taxpayers while rendering meaningful relief elusive.” *In re Grau*, 267  
 2 B.R. 896, 899 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 2001) (quoting *Matter of Munford, Inc.*, 97 F.3d 449, 455 (11th Cir.  
 3 1996)).

4       3.     The United States Supreme Court has expressed that a bankruptcy settlement must be  
 5 fair and equitable. *See Protective Comm. For Indep. Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v.  
 6 Anderson*, 390 U.S. 414 (1968). The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has enunciated that “in order to  
 7 determine whether a proposed settlement is fair and equitable, the bankruptcy court must consider  
 8 four factors: (a) the probability of success in the litigation; (b) the difficulties, if any, to be encountered  
 9 in the matter of collection; (c) the complexity of the litigation involved, and the expense,  
 10 inconvenience and delay necessarily attending it; (d) the paramount interest of the creditors and a  
 11 proper deference to their reasonable views in the premises.” *See In re Stein*, 236 B.R. at 37; *see also*  
 12 *In re A & C Properties*, 784 F.2d at 1381; *Schmitt v. Ulrich*, 215 B.R. 417, 421 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997).  
 13 A trustee is not necessarily required to satisfy each of these factors as long as the factors as a whole  
 14 favor approving the settlement. *See In re Pacific Gas and Electric Co.*, 304 B.R. 395, 416 (Bankr.  
 15 N.D. Cal. 2004); *In re WCI Cable, Inc.*, 282 B.R. 457, 473-74 (Bankr. D. Or. 2002). Further, the  
 16 settlement does *not* have to be the best the trustee could have possibly obtained; rather, the settlement  
 17 must only fall “within the reasonable range of litigation possibilities.” *See In re Adelphia Comm.  
 18 Corp.*, 327 B.R. 143, 159 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2005) (citing *In re Penn Cent. Transp. Co.*, 596 F.2d 1102,  
 19 1114 (3d Cir. 1979) (“Indeed, a court may approve a settlement even if it believes that the Trustee  
 20 ultimately would be successful.”)).

21       4.     There is a range of reasonableness with respect to a settlement—a range which  
 22 recognizes the uncertainties of law and fact in any particular case and the concomitant risks and costs  
 23 necessarily inherent in taking any litigation to completion—and the bankruptcy court will not be  
 24 reversed if the appellate court concludes that the settlement lies within that range. *See id.* (citing  
 25 *Newman v. Stein*, 464 F.2d 689, 693 (2d Cir. 1972)). The bankruptcy court “need not conduct an  
 26 independent investigation into the reasonableness of the settlement but must only ‘canvass the issues  
 27 and see whether the settlement falls below the lowest point in the range of reasonableness.’” *See id.*  
 28 (citing *In re W.T. Grant Co.*, 699 F.2d 599, 608 (2d Cir. 1983)); *see also Ars Brook, LLC v. Jalbert*

1       *(In re Servisense.com, Inc.), 382 F.3d 68, 71-72 (1st Cir. 2004); In re Energy Cooperative, Inc., 886*

2       F.2d 921, 929 (7th Cir. 1989); New Concept Housing, Inc. v. Poindexter et al. (In re New Concept

3       Housing, Inc.), 951 F.2d 932, 938 (8th Cir. 1991).

4           5.       For the reasons set forth below, the *A & C Properties* factors support a finding that the  
 5 Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable and in the best interest of the estate. Accordingly, this  
 6 Court should grant this Motion and approve the Settlement Agreement.

7           **B.       The Probability of Success in Litigation.**

8           1.       The Trustee and chargeIT dispute title to the SCADA Units and Power Converters. In  
 9 order to establish that the SCADA Units and Power Converters are property of the estate, the Trustee  
 10 is required to show that the German retention of title provision in the contract between chargeIT and  
 11 Solutions does not apply.

12           2.       It is chargeIT's position that the Trustee will be unable to establish that the SCADA  
 13 Units and Power Converters do not remain chargeIT's property.

14           3.       Under the contractual arrangement between chargeIT and Solutions, title to the  
 15 SCADA Units remains with chargeIT. Specifically, the General Terms & Conditions include a  
 16 retention of title provision that provides that the property remains the property of chargeIT until  
 17 Solutions has paid in full and that Solutions may not sell the goods or otherwise dispose of the  
 18 ownership thereof:

19           **The Seller shall retain title to the delivered goods until the purchase**  
 20 **price for these goods has been paid in full. During the existence of**  
 21 **the retention of title, the Buyer may not sell the goods (hereinafter also**  
 22 **referred to as "Reserved Goods") or otherwise dispose of the**  
 23 **ownership thereof.**

24           Exhibit 5, General Terms & Conditions § 9 (emphases added).

25           4.       The contractual relationship between the Parties is governed by German law. *See*  
 26 Exhibit 5, General Terms & Conditions § 14 ("The relations between the Seller and the Customer shall  
 27 be subject exclusively to the law of the Federal Republic of Germany."). Under German law, retention  
 28 of title provisions are common. chargeIT alleges that such provisions allow a seller to reclaim its  
 property if it has not been paid in full, even if a company has filed for bankruptcy. Further, under

1 German law, a party that sells property to which it does not possess title will be liable for damages to  
 2 the true title holder.

3       5. Moreover, to the extent that the Trustee seeks to recharacterize the nature of chargeIT's  
 4 interest, i.e., title in the SCADA Units, to a secured interest, or lien, in the SCADA Units, the Trustee  
 5 would have to file an adversary proceeding in this Court, which would incur additional time and  
 6 expense to the estate, without any guarantee of success.

7       6. It is chargeIT's position that the Trustee's claims have a low probability of success  
 8 given the above arguments. Due to the risk involved in pursuing extensive title litigation, the Trustee  
 9 believes that this factor weighs strongly in favor of approval of the Settlement Agreement.

10 **C. Collection Difficulties.**

11       7. In the event that the Trustee prevailed in the dispute over title of the SCADA Units and  
 12 Power Converters, the Trustee believes that chargeIT has the means and willingness to appeal and  
 13 resist any unfavorable result and extend the timeline of this litigation indefinitely. In addition, even if  
 14 the Trustee were successful on appeal, she would still need to shoulder the administrative burden of  
 15 liquidating these assets. As indicated by the results of the auction of the SCADA Units that were sold  
 16 prior to the entry of the Exclusion Order, the SCADA Units were auctioned for roughly 3% of their  
 17 original sale value.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, chargeIT would retain a claim against Solutions for each unit that  
 18 would far exceed the sale value of the sold property. While the SCADA Units sold to Solutions were  
 19 bespoke and are not immediately suitable for resale, their value is maximized by their return to  
 20 chargeIT, to the benefit of the estate and all creditors.

21       8. Overall, litigation regarding and collection through liquidation of these assets will be a  
 22 substantial undertaking; therefore, this factor weighs in favor of approval of the Settlement  
 23 Agreement.

24 **D. The Complexity of the Litigation Involved and the Expense, Inconvenience, and Delay  
 25 Attending It.**

26  
 27       4 Specifically, each SCADA Unit cost upwards of \$1000. At the auction, each lot (constituting  
 28 16 SCADA Units) was priced for roughly \$700 for the entire lot.

1       9. As indicated above, upon learning that its property was to be auctioned, chargeIT  
 2 immediately filed a motion overnight in this Court. chargeIT has at all times stood ready to assert and  
 3 defend its rights to what it contends is its rightful property, including through litigation.

4       10. Such litigation presents complex issues of German law and property rights and would  
 5 require expert witnesses on issues of foreign law and choice of law issues. Such further litigation  
 6 would require significant additional cost, including possible discovery, briefing, and trial, and possibly  
 7 an appeal filed by the losing party. This could delay administration of the bankruptcy estate.

8       11. In addition to the immediate expense saved by the estate through the Settlement  
 9 Agreement and resolving the contested matters, the Settlement Agreement is also certain to eliminate  
 10 any delay. Accordingly, the proposed compromise will result in a favorable resolution for the estate  
 11 without the attendant expense, risk, and delay of further litigation.

12

**E. The Paramount Interest of the Creditors.**

13       12. Under the fourth *A & C Properties* factor, the Court must consider whether approving  
 14 a settlement generally “reflects not only the desire of creditors to obtain the maximum possible  
 15 recovery but also their competing desire that that recovery occur in the least amount of time.” *In re*  
 16 *Marples*, 266 B.R. 202, 207 (Bankr. D. Idaho 2001). As explained above, even assuming the Trustee  
 17 were successful in asserting property rights over the SCADA Units, the SCADA Units that were  
 18 previously sold at auction were sold for an infinitesimal fraction of their original sale price.  
 19 Meanwhile, chargeIT would retain a claim against Solutions for each unit that would far exceed the  
 20 sale value of the sold property. Value is maximized by return of the Reclaimed SCADA Units and  
 21 Reclaimed Power Converters to chargeIT, to the benefit of the estate and all creditors.

22

23       13. As the foregoing analysis illustrates, the four *A&C Properties* factors favor approval  
 24 of the Settlement Agreement as it is fair and reasonable and in the best interest of Solutions and its  
 25 creditors.

26

////

27

////

28

////

1           **II. CONCLUSION**

2           1. Based on the foregoing, the Trustee on behalf of Solutions and chargeIT respectfully  
3 request that the Court enter the order attached hereto as Exhibit "2," thereby granting the *Joint Motion*  
4 *To Approve Settlement Agreement Pursuant To FRBP 9019.*

5           DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2019.

6

7           **Christina W. Lovato, Chapter 7 Trustee**

8           HARTMAN & HARTMAN

9           */s/ Jeffrey L. Hartman*

10

---

11           Jeffrey L. Hartman (1607)  
12           510 West Plumb Lane, Suite B  
13           Reno, NV 89509  
14           Tel: (775) 324-2800  
15           Fax: (775) 324-1818  
16           [jlh@bankruptreno.com](mailto:jlh@bankruptreno.com)

chargeIT Mobility GmbH, Germany

HUTCHISON & STEFFEN, PLLC

*/s/ Jeffrey R. Hall*

---

Jeffrey R. Hall (9572)  
HUTCHISON & STEFFEN, PLLC Peccole  
Professional Park  
10080 West Alta Drive, Suite 200  
Las Vegas, NV 89145  
Tel: (702) 385-2500  
Fax: (702) 385-2086  
[jhall@hutchlegal.com](mailto:jhall@hutchlegal.com)

17           and

18           My Chi To  
19           Erica S. Weisgerber  
20           Danielle Thorne  
21           DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP  
22           919 Third Avenue  
23           New York, NY 10022  
24           Telephone: (212) 909-6000  
25           Fax: (212) 909-6836  
26           [mcto@debevoise.com](mailto:mcto@debevoise.com)  
27           [eweisgerber@debevoise.com](mailto:eweisgerber@debevoise.com)

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2019, a copy of the foregoing document entitled: ***JOINT MOTION TO APPROVE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO FRBP 9019*** by transmitting a copy of same via the Court's CM/ECF Internet system to their respective registered email site.

/s/ *Bobbie Benitez*

---

An Employee of Hutchison & Steffen, PLLC